

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/683,559	10/10/2003	Patrick T. Mather	UCON-166.1 98121.00083	7909	
23413	7590 10/06/2005		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			PEZZUTO, H	PEZZUTO, HELEN LEE	
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1713		
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	\				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/683,559	MATHER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Helen L. Pezzuto	1713			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the (correspondence address			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE INSTRUCTION OF A CITY OF THE MAILING DATE IN THE MAILING THE M	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_ ·				
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5) <u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The specification is objected to be specification in the specification is objected to be specification in the specification is objected to be specification in the spec	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2)						

Application/Control Number: 10/683,559

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, 15, 21-24, drawn to a shape memory polymer, classified in class 526, subclass 90.
 - II. Claims 14 and 16, drawn to a polymer blend, classified in class 525, subclass 123+.
 - III. Claims 17-20, drawn to a method of producing a polymer, classified in class 525, subclass 387.
 - IV. Claims 25-31, drawn to a filler-reinforced polymer, classified in class 524, subclass 404.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I vs. II and I vs. IV are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as is in and of itself without the presence of additional constituents, which

Art Unit: 1713

would react in-situ to produce a mutually exclusive final product species, and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions and utilities. For example, the polymer blend itself can be an integral component in a multicomponet elastomeric composition in forming foamed products; the filler-reinforced polymer can be used to produce molded articles, free standing film, automobile/aircraft composites.

Application/Control Number: 10/683,559

Art Unit: 1713

Page 4

- 4. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the polymer can be made by other viable process method including addition polymerization using Ziegler-Natta, metallocene or other single site coordination catalysts.
- 5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:
- (1) the blending polymer species expressed in claim 14 (in the event that applicant elects Group II).
- (2) the filler species expressed in claim 26 (in the event that applicant elects Group IV).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single ultimate disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Application/Control Number: 10/683,559
Art Unit: 1713

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPER \$ 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1713

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen L. Pezzuto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1108. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 4 PM, Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll/free).

Helen L. Pezzuto Primary Examiner

Art/Unit 1713

hlp